



ما الذي يمكن أن نخبرنا به تحليل المجاز عن تقارير الصحف السياسية؟

هناء عبدالله ابراهيم عوض

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.54172/kt7mdw12>

المستخلص: تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى اكتشاف دور الاستعارة في تقارير الصحف السياسية وما يترتب عنها من تحليل الخطاب النقدي. يركز البحث على تحليل الاستعارات المستخدمة في المقالات التي تتناول جدار الفصل الإسرائيلي، ويستكشف كيف تسهم هذه الاستعارات في تقديم وجهات نظر أيديولوجية مختلفة. يُعتبر الاستعارة لغة قناعية يستخدمها فئة معينة من الناس للتعبير عن آرائها الأيديولوجية أو إخفاءها، ويتيح تحليلها فهمًا أوضح لهذه الآراء. يعتمد البحث تحليلًا نقديًا للاستعارة كنهج لغوي لدراسة الأخبار السياسية. من خلال تحليل مجموعة متنوعة من المقالات، يُظهر البحث أهمية وانتشار الاستعارة في التقارير السياسية ودورها في كشف الأيديولوجيات الكامنة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستعارة - تحليل الخطاب النقدي - التقارير السياسية - الأيديولوجيا

What can an analysis of metaphor tell us about newspaper political reporting?

Abstract: This research paper examines the role of metaphor in newspaper political reporting and its implications for critical discourse analysis. The study focuses on the analysis of metaphors used in articles discussing the Israeli separation wall and explores how these metaphors contribute to the presentation of different ideological perspectives. Metaphor is considered a persuasive language that can express or conceal ideological outlooks, and its analysis allows for a clearer understanding of these perspectives. The paper adopts critical metaphor analysis as a linguistic approach to studying political news. By analyzing a range of articles, the research demonstrates the significance and prevalence of metaphor in political reporting and its role in uncovering underlying ideologies.

Keywords: Metaphor - Critical discourse analysis - Political reporting - Ideology

“Critical discourse analysis CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political contexts” (Van Dijk in Schiffrin, Tannen and Hamilton 2001, p 352). Critical discourse analysis has three concepts which are essential for analysing texts and that is the reason that they “create meaning in their interaction with texts” (Wodak and Mayer 2001, p 3). These concepts are: firstly, the concept of power that is “about relations of difference, and a particularly about the effects of differences in social structures” (Wodak and Mayer 2001, p 11); secondly, the concept of history that “attempts to integrate a large quantity of available knowledge about the historical sources and the background of the social and political fields in which discursive events are embedded” (Wodak and Mayer 2001, p 65); finally, the concept of ideology which this essay will adopt with the aim of analysing the data texts of this essay. The reason for choosing this concept is that the articles I have chosen, which are about the Israeli separation wall, are presenting different ideological perspectives of different ethnic groups (the Israeli and Palestinian people) by means of using different types of metaphors. Ideology is defined as an opinion, belief, or an attitude that is shared by a group of people. Van Dijk (2000a, p 6) says that

Ideologies have something to do with systems of ideas, and especially with the social, political or religious ideas shared by a social group or movement. Communism as well as anti-communism, socialism and liberalism, feminism and sexism, racism and antiracism, pacifism and militarism, are examples of widespread ideologies.

According to Van Dijk, ideology in discourse has some structures and strategies. One of these strategies or structures is the Rhetorical Structures which consist of “forms: repetition. meanings: comparisons, metaphors, irony, euphemisms, hyperboles, number games” (Van Dijk 2006, p 126). This essay will concentrate on one of the meanings’ rhetorical structures which are

metaphors. Metaphor is a persuasive language that a specific group of people could use in order to express or conceal their ideological outlooks. As a result, by analyzing metaphor, these ideological perspectives will be lucid and visible. Charteris-Black (2004, p 29) states that “the primary aim of CDA analysis is to make explicit political and ideological motivations that would, otherwise, be implicit or concealed. It is a major claim of this work that analysis of metaphor is one way in which this can be done”. In addition, O’Halloran (2007, p1) declares that “one aspect of critical discourse analysis CDA involves examining how metaphors in texts, particularly hard news texts (reports of very recent conflicts, crimes, etc.), imply certain values”. Although metaphor was marginalized and neglected by classical linguistic theorists, because it was thought that metaphor is a poetic language that cannot be used in everyday language such as politics, it is considered now one of the most important approaches in studying and analyzing political news. Critical metaphor analysis is a linguistic approach of metaphor “that enables us to challenge existing ways of thinking and feeling about human behavior and its relation to language; it also enables us to create an alternative way of thinking and feeling about human behavior and communicating it to others” (Charteris-Black 2004, p 252). This essay will analyze a range of different articles that are dealing with the issue of the Israeli separation wall. The analysis aim is to prove how metaphor is significant and widespread in political reporting and how it is important in revealing the ideologies beyond writing the reports. This essay will present first of all, a summary of the concept of ideology that will be followed by metaphor’s theory and then the data analysis of three political articles will be put forward; afterwards, the essay will offer the results of the analysis of these articles.

Ideology is one of CDA concepts which play a central role in analyzing texts of politics or hard articles. Van Dijk (1998, p 8) define ideology as

The basis of social representations shared by members of a group. This means that ideologies allow people, as group members, to organize the multitude of social beliefs about what is the case, good or bad, right or wrong, for them and to act accordingly.

When ideology is shared by a group of people, it will get the same meaning of a common sense which means the opinion or the attitude of a particular group has been naturalized in it. However, if it is diverted and varied, it will carry the same meaning of social conflict, struggle or racism. According to Fairclough (2001, p 73), "In a society where power relationships are clear cut and stable, one would not expect to find a great deal of ideological diversity...ideological diversity sets limits on what I have been calling ideological common sense". On the same page Fairclough adds that these contradictory ideologies "come from differences in position, experience, and interests between social groupings, which enter into relationship (and, as we shall see, ideological conflict) with each other in terms of power". The ideological diversity is representing the current situation of the Palestinian and Israeli conflict and their struggle in order to sustain one of these ideologies instead of the other or to confirm the rights of one group in defending itself against the other. Therefore, an ideology of one of them is considered unacceptable or odd for the other and that leads to the existence of dominant and dominated minorities. Consequently, this dominating leads to oppressing weak people and suppressing their rights in conveying and expressing their ideologies. Fairclough (2001, p 73) declares that "having the power to determine things like which word meanings or which linguistic and communicative norms are legitimate or correct or appropriate is an important aspect of social and ideological struggle". This ideological struggle is happening in all discourse types such as economic, religious and political discourse types. For example,

In politics, each opposing party or political force tries to win general acceptance for its own discourse type as the preferred and ultimately the (natural) one for talking and writing about the state, government, forms of political actions, and all aspects of politics”.

In addition, ideologies are not just possessed by dominant or powerful groups but also by dominated and powerless ones and their ideology is represented by their struggle and their refusal of the others’ ideology. Ideologies are demonstrating either sides, either a weak, strong, positive or negative one. According to Van Dijk (2006, p 117),

Ideologies are not necessarily ‘negative’ (there are racist as well as antiracist ideologies, communist and anticommunist ones); they are not some kind of ‘false consciousness’ (whatever that is exactly); they are not necessarily dominant, but may also define resistance and opposition; they are not the same as discourses or other social practices that express, reproduce or enact them; and they are not the same as any other socially shared beliefs or belief systems.

These ideologies are illustrated and expressed by the use of language such as metaphors which are employed “persuasively to convey evaluations and therefore constitute part of the ideology of texts” (Charteris-Black 2004, p 28). In addition, Van Dijk (in Ter Wal and Verkuyten 2000b, p 95) says that “ideologies may indirectly influence mental models. Because such biased mental models are the cognitive structures on which social practices and discourse are based”. Both these quotations infer that ideology and metaphor are strongly related to each other or alternatively metaphor is a part of ideology. This relation results from their cognitive processes and their strong influence in expressing opinions and beliefs of a specific group or society. Consequently, every metaphor expresses specific ideology such as, racist and antiracist ideologies. This is proved by Fairclough (2001, p 100) who states that “different metaphors have different ideological

attachments". For example, humanizing and dehumanizing metaphors are metaphors that indicate implicitly or explicitly some racist and antiracist ideologies. Differentiating between racist and non-racist ideologies is a complex process because it is not viable for the racist group to confess their racist attitudes. Van Dijk (in Ter Wal and Verkuyten 2000b, p 97) says that there are some features that could define racist beliefs and attitudes. These features are:

A: membership devices: by color, race or nationality, e.g., "we white people"

B: activities: racist practices/discourse (talking negatively about minorities, discrimination, differentiation exclusion, inferiorisation and problematisation etc.)

C: goals: "keeping them down and out".

D: values: e.g., the purity and priority of their own group.

E: position: superiority and dominance over others.

F: resources: "our" territory, space, nation, and white color, and preferential access to social resources.

These negative attitudes are representing the racist group's beliefs towards specific minorities such as "black" minorities or immigrant minorities. As mentioned above this could be expressed throughout discourse (oral or written discourse) and throughout using rhetorical language such as metaphors.

Metaphor is one of the rhetorical or figurative languages that have a strong persuasive effect on people's attitudes. This rhetorical type is used widely in political discourse by leaders or by executive characters with the intention of persuading or manipulating their people to follow or accept a definite policy.

There is a debate on the definition of metaphor between the classical and the contemporary theorists of metaphor. The classical theorists define metaphor as a poetic and grandiloquent language that cannot be used in everyday language. However, the contemporary theorists such as Lakoff and Johnson (1992, p 3) declare that “metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action”. Lakoff (in Ortony 1993, p 203) adds that “the word metaphor has come to mean a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system”. Lakoff’s definition of metaphor has transferred the perspective of metaphor from being a poetic and novel language to be an outcome of the conceptual system of everyday language. Kovecses (2002, p 16-24) has made a survey in order to prove that metaphor is used in everyday language in all life aspects. These metaphors are: “to shoulder a responsibility, a healthy society, the fruit of her labor, she constructed a coherent argument, she swept me off my feet, he went crazy, she was bursting with joy, and the president plays hardball”. These metaphorical linguistic expressions are from different domains of life such as politics and economics that support the contemporary theorists’ definition. On the other hand, Lakoff’s definition for metaphor has been argued by Charteris-Black (2004, p 20) who declares that “definitions of metaphor need to be to incorporate: a linguistic, a pragmatic and a cognitive orientation...metaphor is not, then, exclusively a linguistic, pragmatic or cognitive phenomenon”. That is because analyzing metaphor throughout pragmatics reveals the intentions beyond saying or writing it and also because, according to Grice, who are one of the pragmatics’ theorists, metaphors are flouting the maxim of quality. According to Charteris-Black (2004, p 28), “Metaphor analysis should be a central component of critical discourse analysis. This is because metaphors are used persuasively to convey evaluations and therefore constitute part of the ideology of the texts”.

There are many types for metaphor such as orientational and concrete metaphor. Nevertheless, in this essay I will concentrate on another three types of metaphor. These types are: container metaphor, humanizing metaphor (personification) and dehumanizing metaphor. The reason for the concentration on these types is that my data articles are almost full of these metaphors.

Container metaphor is one of the structural metaphors (the ontological metaphor) that make the conceiving of abstract objects in the world as physical ones by defining the object and making in and out boundaries for it. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p 29) explain that by saying “we are physical beings, bounded and set off from the rest of the world by the surface of our skins, and we experience the rest of the world as outside us. Each of us is a container with a bounding surface and in-out orientation”. Cities and countries, especially in political discourses, are almost conceptualized and presented as containers that have in and out boundaries; for example, for protecting their local people from outside threats. This metaphor represents specific ideologies for the container country such as racist ideologies which are illustrated in some political discourses against some minorities such as immigrants. Defining boundaries such as constructing walls or putting restricting laws are “act of quantification” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p 29). This act also reflects the racist ideologies which are represented in keeping out unacceptable people who are distinguished from the national people by their colour, race or by their religion. Lakoff and Johnson’s definition for the container metaphor has a limitation in dealing with it as a cognitive and structural one. Nevertheless, this should be defined cognitively, linguistically and pragmatically in order to recognize the motivation and the intentions beyond saying or writing this metaphor. Charteris-Black (2004, p 9) declares that:

Cognitive semantic approach also needs to be complemented with an analysis of pragmatic factors as metaphors are always used within a specific communication context

that governs their role. Therefore, their cognitive characteristics cannot be treated in isolation from their persuasive function in discourse”.

Container metaphor is pervasive in political discourse. It is viewing political events and problems outside and inside countries. Moreover, the container metaphor represents that which is inside the law as legal and what is outside it as illegal. Charteris-Black (2006, p 575) proves the importance of container metaphor in political discourse, which stands for a specific ideological attitude, by giving an example from a newspaper that describes the British attitudes towards the immigration rate in the UK. For example, “Britain is full up”. This example conceptualized the British nation as a container for the immigrants who are portrayed as a fluid. This metaphor exemplifies racist ideology because it embodies that immigrants, who are different in race or in religion, are illustrating a threat for the British economy and society and that is by portraying the immigrants as a flood, a natural disaster, which will cause economic and social losses for the UK. Hart (2008, p 101) says that:

When hearers are prompted to conceptualize immigration to Britain as a flowing of water into a container already at capacity, elaboration of such a network makes available the inference that Britain could overflow, an inference which again immediately justifies restrictive immigration policy.

This interprets that the intentions and the ideological motivations beyond writing or saying this metaphor is to persuade national people that their country is facing a threat and this threat should be restricted and resisted. Hart (2005, p 6) says that “certain language-use (discourse) could influence conceptualization and cognition, manipulating the individuals into a position of support for some policy”. This is argued by Lee (1992, p 83) who says that in the container metaphor “we

have to reject the idea that speakers simply select those sentences that carry meanings corresponding to those in their minds”.

Personification (humanization) is another type of ontological metaphor which means giving human characteristics to what is not human. For example, “inflation has attacked the foundation of our economy; Inflation has robbed me of my savings”. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p33-34) explains those examples by saying “Here inflation is personified, but the metaphor is not merely INFLATION IS A PERSON. It is much more specific, namely, inflation is an adversary. It not only gives us a very specific way of thinking about inflation but also a way of acting toward it”. This quotation interprets that personifying non human entities is a way of expressing a particular ideological perspective; as a consequence personification is used widely in political discourse. Personification is used by politicians in favour of magnifying some issues to justify taking some decisions against these issues. For example, terrorism is threatening our nation; terrorism violates our security system; terrorism should be attacked. This type of discourse is mostly used by dominant group/members of a group in order to persuade or manipulate the dominated group with their ideological beliefs for adopting a particular strategy that suits the dominant ideology. This type of metaphor also advocates Charteris-Black’s point of view when he says that beyond every metaphor there is an intention which aims either to persuade or change people’s attitudes, “this is why critical analysis of metaphor can provide insight into the beliefs, attitudes and feelings of the discourse community in which they occur” (Charteris-Black 2004, p 13). In political discourse, often, nations are described as a weak or a strong person. Lakoff (in Ortony, 1993, p 243) gives an example illustrating humanization of nations which will be as a proof for its importance in political discourse. This example is:

Strong states are seen as male, and weak states are female, so that an attack by a strong state on weak state can be seen as a rape, as in the rape of Kuwait by Iraq. A “just war” is conceptualized as a fairy tale with villain, victim, and hero rescues the victim. Thus, the US in the Gulf war was portrayed as having “rescued” Kuwait.

The other type of metaphor, which this essay will deal with, is dehumanizing metaphor. This type, the opposite of humanization/personification metaphor, is giving non-human characteristics (animals or insects features) for human beings. Although “the concept of dehumanization lacks a systematic theoretical basis, and research that addresses it has yet to be integrated” (Haslam 2006, p 252), I have insisted in writing about this metaphor in order to analyze and recognize the motivations beyond writing dehumanizing expressions involved in one of the articles that I have selected. Dehumanizing metaphor exists mostly in discourse of conflict, struggle, and racism. Haslam (2006, p 252) declares that by saying “dehumanization is arguably most often mentioned in relation to ethnicity, race, and related topics such as immigration and genocide”. Consequently, this type reflects negative ideological attitudes and beliefs of a specific group towards another. Dehumanizing has been used widely after 11th Sep 2001 in political discourse and in western media for describing not just the terrorists who commit this terrorist attack but also it is generalized by dehumanizing all Arab and Muslim people. Steuter and Wills (2009, p 7) prove that throughout their data analysis for the Canadian news media by saying “an analysis of the data reveals a pattern of dehumanizing language applied to enemy leaders as well as Arab and Muslim citizens at large in the media’s uncritical reproduction of metaphors that linguistically frame the enemy in particular ways”.

In the following data analysis, I will endeavour to answer two questions which are raised by Norman Fairclough (2001, p 92) regarding analyzing vocabulary. These questions are: "What expressive values do words have? What metaphors are used?"

In my data analysis, I will use three different newspapers articles which are on the topic of "The Israeli Security Separation Wall". Each of these articles reflects a specific ideology by using different types of metaphors. These articles will accompany this essay as an appendix.

The first article is from "The Guardian" newspaper that carries a title of (Israel's barrier to progress). This article has used some explicit and implicit dehumanizing metaphors which Van Teeffelen (1994, p 385) says are mostly

Used to frame the other's identity and actions, and to show how it threatens the integrity of the self, whether physically or socially. Invasion plague, cancer, pollution and wild animals are familiar notions to evoke a boundary threat to in-group conceived in terms of organic development and growth, family cohesion and purity

These dehumanizing metaphors are also mostly related to racist ideologies which present negative values for minorities in favour of dominating and keeping them down. This will be proved here by noticing how the writer expresses the Israeli ideology by describing the Palestinian radicals or the "suicide bombers" as wild animals in a cage that are banging their heads against a wall (such as buffaloes or oxen) in order to get out of it and kill innocent people "the Israeli women and children". Although these animals are not mentioned, the expression of "banging their heads against the wall" is non-human behavior such as the animals I have indicated above. These metaphorical expressions are written in italic and bold in the following quotation that is from the Guardian newspaper.

If mainstream Israeli thinking is to be believed, the "security" wall is vital for the safety of Israel's citizens, the implication being that scores of would-be bombers are daily banging their heads against a concrete wall as they try desperately to reach Israeli cities to unleash carnage on unsuspecting women and children. However, the facts simply don't add up. If 40% percent of a mosquito net was removed, the remaining mesh would have no protective effect, since the insects would simply sail through the hole and get on with their blood-sucking task unimpeded. Yet, according to the Israeli authorities, that is not the case when it comes to the separation wall, and millions of Israelis are all too eager to swallow the lie in order to achieve a deceptive peace of mind.

The second dehumanizing metaphor used in this article also carries a racist ideology and presents a negative evaluation of the Palestinian people who are resisting the separation wall by describing them as mosquitoes which are living by absorbing people's blood and which are spreading diseases among people. If we consider these metaphorical expressions pragmatically, we will reveal that the writer's motivations beyond writing these rhetorical and racist expressions is to send a persuasive message for the Israeli government that they are still menaced by Palestinian suicide bombers in spite of the construction of the wall and also to say that the wall will not solve problems. On the contrary, it will make issues more complicated as a result of oppressing the Palestinians and this subjugation will lead them to be more aggressive. The writer's message is obvious when he uses implicit dehumanizing metaphor for the Israeli government by describing them as ostriches that bury their heads in sand when they feel frightened and neglect the fact that their enemy is coming.

Instead of burying their heads in the sand and pretending that all is well in terms of Israelis' security as a result of an incomplete wall, Israel's leaders ought to be worried

about the consequences of continuing their policies of intransigence towards the Palestinians.

Although this expression is a dehumanizing metaphor, it seems mild in comparison with the other dehumanizing metaphors that are used for the Palestinians. The Israeli dehumanizing metaphor is for a peaceful bird, which is the ostrich, whereas the Palestinian's metaphor is for wild animal that kills people as well as for a hazardous insect "mosquito" that causes diseases that may kill people. The example which is given by the writer when he describes the wall as a mosquito net is also a container metaphor where he portrays Israel as a room that has a window with an incompleated mosquito net. This metaphor also presents negative evaluation for the Palestinians who are illustrated as a threat for Israeli people who are conceptualized in this metaphor as victims of the insects that exploit the existence of a hole in the net to suck their blood. Although the writer seems neutral in presenting the wall issue, his metaphorical expressions for Palestinians are more excessive than those used for the Israelis.

The second article is from "The Times" newspaper the title of which is (Israel and US defy ruling on "illegal" security barrier). This article consists of sixteen paragraphs; seven of them include personifications that are sustaining that the barrier is illegal and it is also suppressing Palestinians rights. This article seems to be anti-racist and anti-barrier article which is comprehensible by means of personifications. If we look at the second paragraph, we will see that the barrier is portrayed as a cruel and unfair person who restrains Palestinians. The wall is also personified in the third paragraph where it is shown as gravedigger for the Palestinians' rights which is also personified as a person who can be dead or alive. Those paragraphs are:

The court also ruled that reparations should be paid to thousands of Palestinians who have suffered hardship because of the barrier.

In an uncompromising ruling the court declared that the 430-mile barrier was a “grave infringement” of the rights of Palestinians to work, health, property and education. It insisted that it could not be justified by Israel’s battle to keep suicide bombers out.

Those personifications express negative evaluation for the barrier which is illustrated as racist and as a grave infringement of the Palestinians’ rights. This article also presents the ideological conflict (ideological diversity) between the Israeli and the Palestinian people that one of them is personifying the wall negatively and the other is personifying it positively. This conflict is clear in paragraph 12 of this article:

The Israeli Government insists that the barrier has already proved successful at keeping Palestinian suicide bombers out of its cities. However, the PLO says that it is a land grab and will set the borders for the creation of an independent Palestinian state.

The Israeli government uses personification in order to confirm the success of the wall in protecting it to justify building it to be accepted and advocated by the international court. On the other hand, the Palestinian government uses personification to confirm their rejection for constructing this wall because they believe it is a land grab. This confirmation is also for gaining support from the international court in order to convince the Israeli government to abstain from building the wall. I think the writer of this article is biased to the Palestinian’s ideology of the land grab because he tries to explain the reality of this expression by saying:

Most of the barrier lies within the territories occupied by Israel after the 1967 war, and weaves in a highly circuitous route in and out of communities, trying to keep Israeli settlers on one side and Palestinian towns on the other. It effectively annexes 975 sq km, or 16.5 per cent, of the occupied land, but has 51 per cent of its water supply, and holds 80 per cent of the Israeli settlers. Paragraph (13)

It is conspicuous that there is over-wording for the wall personifications which are mostly used by the court that is trying desperately to stop construction of the separation wall. These personifications are:

The court noted that the barrier separates thousands of Palestinians from their agricultural land, water, schools and hospitals....the court ruled: the construction of the wall and its associated regime impede the liberty and the movement of the inhabitants. They also impede the exercise by persons...The wall separates many Palestinians from their land and water and leaves them with no other means of substance...The wall deprived the Palestinians of the right to choose their residence.

These humanizations expressions illustrate the wall as a criminal in a court who is accused of committing a great deal of crimes that cannot be justified. The defenders of this criminal are the USA and Israel. This description is comprehensible from the title and the first paragraph which declare that:

Israel and US defy ruling on illegal security barrier... Israel and the US pledged to defy the International Court of Justice yesterday after the UN's supreme legal body ruled that the West Bank barrier is illegal and should be pulled down.

The third article is from the Independent newspaper that adopted a title of "Israel orders new fence to keep out African migrants". It is obvious from the title that the article is full of

container metaphor since it deals with borders (separation wall) and who should be outside of them and who should be inside them. This metaphor starts from the first paragraph that presents the Israeli racist ideology towards the African asylum seekers. This paragraph is

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has ordered the construction of two massive fences along his country's southern border with Egypt in a bid to keep out African asylum seekers he claims are threatening the country's Jewish character.

In this paragraph, the Israeli country is illustrated as a container whose substances should be just Jewish characters and that should get rid of any non-Jewish ones such as Africans who are represented as a threat for the container and its substances. This kind of metaphor is used mostly in political discourse that carries racist ideology; especially, discourses that are concerned with immigrants and refugees issues. Africans, in this article, are evaluated negatively where they are portrayed as a threat, terrorists, and fluid (the substance) that are trickling and infiltrating illegally inside the Israeli country (the container). The motivations beyond writing or saying this metaphor are to persuade and frighten the Israeli people that their country might overflow with Africans who might cause a natural disaster (flood) that might have severe and fatal effects on their society and economy. Consequently, the government will gain acceptance with one voice from their people for justifying policies of resisting those asylum seekers.

In the second paragraph, there are personification and container metaphors.

The barrier will also thwart terrorists from infiltrating the porous border, according to Mr. Netanyahu. "We are talking about a strategic decision to

guarantee the Jewish and democratic character of the state of Israel," Mr. Netanyahu said.

Both of these metaphors are also representing the Israeli ideology towards the wall and towards the African refugees. Those metaphors evaluate the wall positively and the refugees negatively where the wall represents peace and safety from African asylum seekers who are represented as terrorists. In this paragraph, one side of the container (Israel) is represented as a leaky or spongy side which should be sealed in order not to absorb any unpleasant fluid (African refugees).

In this article, it is noticeable that there is over-wording of this kind of metaphor which is sustaining the racist ideology towards those minorities (African refugees). Those expressions are:

Paragraph 5: Although the army began planning the fence in 2005, Mr. Netanyahu's backing for it now is part of a wider crackdown against the influx.

Paragraph 6: Egyptian police killed at least 28 Sudanese refugees during a protest in 2005, the year people began trickling to Israel.

Paragraph 7: The infiltration of the migrants is threatening the very existence of Israel and its character.

The Israeli racist ideology is revealed in this article by some Israeli critics and also by the writer of this article who says in paragraph 7 that "the country defines itself as both a Jewish and democratic state; something its leaders believe depends on maintaining the country's present clear Jewish majority". As a consequence, this unveils the reason for using container metaphor in this discourse and also exposes the ideology beyond this metaphor. The racist ideology could also be revealed by following Van Dijk's categories (in Ter Wal and Verkuyten 2000b, 97) which have been mentioned above in the theory. First of all, membership devices: such as "securing Jewish and democratic character of the state of Israel"; secondly, activities: by presenting negative expressions

and metaphors for the African expatriates such as fluid, influx or terrorists; finally, the goals of the Israeli government of keeping refugees out of Israel in order to keep it pure Jewish country. These racist attitudes are expressed by means of the container metaphor.

In the penultimate part of this essay, we will transform the concentration from the analysis of the articles to the results of them. Analyzing metaphors has shown the importance and efficiency of metaphors in political discourse. It has shown that metaphors are not mere language but they are persuasive language aimed at talking and writing about sensitive issues such as the Israeli Separation Wall. It also verifies that some political reporting uses a particular type of metaphor in order to convey an ideology that presents and sustains some negative or positive evaluations for some political matters.

In the first article, it is presented that metaphors such as dehumanizing metaphors are used for illustrating racist ideology towards a specific group by giving them some characteristics of animals or insects to show how violent they are and also to show themselves as victims of those aggressive groups; for example, when the writer of this article (The Guardian) creates a similarity between Palestinian suicide bombers and mosquitoes that are killing innocent Israeli people.

In the second article, it is proved that the personification (humanizing) metaphor could be operated for conveying either racist or anti-racist ideologies in order to sustain and confirm them. In this article, The Times, personification is used for confirming anti-racist ideology by personifying the problem (the wall) and repeating this personification in the article either by repeating the exact vocabulary or by creating a synonym for it; for example, when the separation wall is portrayed as

an immoral or criminal person who tyrannizes the Palestinians and deprives their rights. These personifications are confirming that the Palestinians are victims of this separation wall.

In the third article, *The Independent*, container metaphor is used widely. It is used from the beginning of the article to show the Israeli ideology towards the African migrants where Israel is portrayed as a container and Israeli people are the original substance (in-group) and the Africans are the out-group who are differentiated by their race. By means of container metaphor, it is illustrated that the in-group (Israeli people) are being threatened and they are in danger because of the out-group (African refugees) who are described as a fluid that is infiltrating and trickling illegally inside the container (Israel).

In general, metaphors that are used in these three articles (personification, dehumanizing, and container metaphor) are activated in this political issue (the separation wall) in order to validate and legalize obtaining specific policies in relation to this issue. For example, in the first article, dehumanizing metaphors are used by the writer with the intention of proving that the wall is not a solution for keeping out suicide bombers; nevertheless, it will make them more aggressive and violent. Consequently, the Israeli government should find other solutions instead of the wall for protecting themselves. In the second article, personification is used to confirm and prove that the wall is illegal and should be pulled down. Finally, in the third article, the container metaphor is used by the Israeli government in order to persuade the Israeli people and the world that their society is at risk because of the African refugees. As a result, the wall should be built and constructed.

To sum up, this essay has endeavoured to present an explicit introduction that aims to show the relationship between the Critical Discourse Analysis and metaphor by merging the

metaphor's theory with one of the CDA concepts which is the ideology concept in analyzing political reports. This essay aims also to prove how metaphor is significant and pervasive in political reporting and how using different types of metaphors can reflect or conceal the ideological perspective of the political reports such as racist or anti-racist ideology. This has been exposed by means of analyzing three political articles from different newspapers (The Guardian, The Times, and The Independent) that carry and deal with the same subject which is (The Israeli Separation Wall). The three political articles have illustrated this issue in different ways by using various types of metaphors such as dehumanization, personification and container metaphor. Each one of the articles has obtained one of these metaphors with the aim of expressing a specific ideology that strives to confirm the right and gain supporters for adopting specific policies. Analyzing those three articles has confirmed the effectiveness of metaphor analysis in revealing the ideologies that could be implicit or concealed by activating metaphors. The analysis has also supported Charteris-Black's opinion that the metaphors should be analyzed not just cognitively but also pragmatically in order to recognize the motivations beyond writing or saying metaphors. By using metaphor in political discourse, it is sustained that metaphor is part of the concept of ideology and its analysis is a sort of critical discourse analysis whose aim is "to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden". (Wodak and Meyer 2001, p 15)

WORD COUNT: 6055

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BROWNE, Anthony (2004). Israel and US Defy Ruling on Illegal Security Barrier.
[Online]. The Times, 10 July. Last accessed 26 April 2010 at:
<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/article455834.ece>
- CHARTERIS-BLACK, Jonathan (2004). Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- CHARTERIS-BLACK, Jonathan (2006). "Britain As A container: Immigration Metaphor In the 2005 Election Campaign". Discourse and Society, 17 (5), 563-581.
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman (2001). Language and Power. 2nd ed., Harlow, Longman.
- FREEDMAN, Seth (2009). Israeli Barrier to Progress. [Online]. The Guardian, 22 July.
Last Accessed 26 April 2010 at:
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/jul/22/israel-wall-security-palestine>
- HART, Christopher (2005). "Analysing Political Discourse: Toward a cognitive Approach". Critical Discourse Studies, 2(2), 189-194.
- HART, Christopher (2008). "Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: toward a theoretical framework". Critical Discourse Studies, 5 (2), 91- 106.

- HASLAM, Nick (2006). "Dehumanization: An integrative Review". *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(3), 252-264.
- KOVECSES, Zoltan (2002). *Metaphor: A practical Introduction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- LAKOFF, George and JOHNSON, Mark (1980). *Metaphor We Live By*. London, The University of Chicago.
- LAKOFF, George (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, in: ORTONY, Andrew, (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 202-251.
- LEE, David (1992). *Competing Discourses: Perspective and Ideology in Language*. London, Longman.
- LYNFIELD, Ben (2010). Israel Orders New Fence to Keep out African Migrants. [Online]. *The Independent*, 12 January. Last Accessed 26 April 2010 at:
<<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/israel-orders-new-fence-to-keep-out-african-migrants-1864827.html>>
- O'HALLORAN, Kieran (2007). "Critical Discourse Analysis and The corpus-informed Interpretation of Metaphor at The Register Level". *Applied Linguistics*, 28(1), 1-24.
- STEUTER, Erin and WILLS, Deborah (2009). "Discourses of Dehumanization: Enemy Construction and Canadian Media Complicity in The framing of The war on Terror". *Global Media Journal*. 2 (2), 7-24.

- VAN DIJK, Teun. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary Approach*. London, SAGE Publication.
- VAN DIJK, Teun. A. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*, in: SHIFFRIN, Deborah, TANNEN, Deborah and HAMILTON, Heidi, (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford, Blackwell publishing, 352-371.
- Van DIJK, Teun. A. (2006). "Ideology and Discourse Analysis". *Journal of Political Discourse*. 11(2), 115-140.
- VAN DIJK Teun. A. (2000a). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University. [Online]. Last accessed on 22 April 2010 at:
[http:// www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf](http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf)
- VAN DIJK T.A. (2000b). *Ideologies, Racism, Discourse: Debates on Immigration and Ethnic Issues*. In: TER WAL, Jessica and VERKUYTEN, Maykel (eds.). *Comparative Perspectives on Racism*. Aldershot, Ashgate, 91-115.
- .VAN TEEFFELEN T (1994). "Racism and Metaphor: The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict in Popular Literature". *Discourse and Society*. 5(3), 381-405.
- WODAK, Ruth and MICHAEL, Meyer (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, SAGE Publications.